

STAT

Parsippany, N.J. 07054  
October 17, 1969

Government Executive Magazine  
Shoreham Building  
806 15th St., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Gentlemen:

I have read your first few issues with some interest, and congratulate your efforts. Keep up the good work! I have some questions about an article in your October issue, however--the CIA item on page 19. The CIA seems to be in season again of late, so I'm sure you felt you had to get in your licks. Your article rings of a much more intimate view than the others, though, to the extent that you actually seem to have gotten CIA employees to express their views! However, I am confused by what appear to be inconsistencies in the 'track' of your article, and would appreciate some clarification, if you would:

You imply in your second paragraph that what you call the "classic battle" is in some way attributable to the Nixon Administration, but I can see no follow-on reasons or explanation for that implication--did you mean it, or did I infer something not intended?

You state that your CIA sources "represent a cross section of young and old", but you fail to mention the size of your cross section--ie., have you talked with 2 people or 200? Or, better yet, what percentage of the total workforce does your cross section represent? Are you talking about 2%, 10%, or 50% of the total number of CIA analysts? Any good mathematician or analyst (or magazine writer, for that matter) would be anxious, if he had a good case, to show the size of the population sample he used to draw his conclusion(s)!

You say "Many of the (experts) .... are simply out of the mainstream", then you turn around and say "the experts have had the guts to disagree with popular concepts", then you reverse again to talk about "the bureaucratic mechanism of the conference to muzzle the experts", yet you point out that no one at such a conference is as "capable or perceptive" as the experts--wouldn't the "expert's" opinion hold sway in any case, no matter where he was, or who (or how many) else were present?

You imply in one place that it is "the senior officer" present who makes the final judgement (on an intelligence question), while in another paragraph you state that the final version is a consensus "of everyone remotely concerned with the problem." Which is it? And again, wouldn't the "expert's" opinion (if he was, really, an expert) prevail?

The innuendos, allusions, and insinuations are just too numerous and general; I was left, after reading the article, with a very distinct aftertaste of sour grapes. Is it possible--just possible--that the author



of the article and/or his sources are either some of the "young staffers" he (or she) speaks of, or perhaps some of the disgruntled, angry "persons with indepth knowledge and virtually unassailable judgement and proven records of performance" (NOW REALLY!) mentioned, and, in fact, are very few in number? If so, I think you have done the CIA, the intelligence community, and, most especially, your readers a considerable disservice. I would expect better of such a young, aspiring magazine!

Sincerely,



STAT



1	ro	[redacted] troops.	INITIALS	CIRCULATE
			DATE	COORDINATION
2			FILE	
			INFORMATION	
3			NOTE AND RETURN	
			PER CON-VERSATION	
4			SEE ME	
			SIGNATURE	

REMARKS

I thought you might be interested in knowing that I took up the cudgel in your defense. I'm quite sure that the Executive article was written by one [redacted] (a former disgruntled OSR employee, I believe; now on the Executive's staff) and, as a former (non-disgruntled) employee myself, I couldn't resist the temptation to challenge his rather obvious case of "sour grapes", even hidden as he thought it was in generalizations and anonymity.

I know how ham-strung you all are to try to defend yourselves; I thought whatever little I could do to try to keep (them) honest would be worth the effort. Would you be interested in seeing what response I get, if any?

Keep up the good work-----.

STAT FROM [redacted]

DATE 22 Oct 69

PHONE [redacted]